Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

in this. But we can go farther than this in the explanation of *leber*. Kluge, s. v., gives a Germanic ĭ-vowel, and this *liĭb- may derive from *liĝhw-*, and its *-r* suffix be a remnant of the old lost word for 'liver' corresponding to Lat. *jecur*. This treatment of *ĝhw*‖*ĝh* is seen also in Ger. *abend*; Eng. even-(ing): Sk. ahan- 'day' (cf. *supra*). We have a similar treatment of -b- in Ger. *Eben*, Eng. *even*: Lat. *aequus*. The gradation is á‖ai.

If we may regard German *lende* 'loins' as borrowed from Slavic we have an explanation to our hands for O. Bulg. *lędwĭ* as a bit of conservation and adaptation. *Lędwĭ* means 'kidneys,' 'loins.' If the association of liver, lungs, heart and kidneys in the haslet with the tongue as a generally similar and edible inmeat be a natural one, so we might expect 'kidneys' to be linguistically corrected with 'tongue.' The nasalisation in *lędwi* may have been the first stage in the affection of the early Slavic representation of *liĝh*; and *-dwĭ* for **-gwĭ* is possibly an affection from *jędro* 'testiculus,' *jętro* 'liver.' In Lat. *lumbi* 'loins,' 'genital organs,' we have, perhaps, the same development of meaning. For the group *-mb-* cf. *lambo* above.

I note, finally, that in O. Bulg. *jętro* we have, perhaps, the original Aryan word for liver. From Sk. *yákṛt* Gen. *yaknás*, Gr. Gen. ἥπατος, we can assume an early Slavic *je-kn-t-* and a *je-kr*. These, by contamination, would result in a stem *jętr-*. Cf. Lat. *jecinoris*. Miklosich, s. v., refers the form to Gr. ἔντερον 'in'ards,' as a borrowing.

Perhaps, O. Bulg. *lŭgati* 'lie,' ought to be referred to *luĝhw-*<(*g*)*l̥ĝhw*. We might then explain Gothic *lugum* 'we lied,' *lugans* 'lying' as borrowed words, to which the forms *liugan*, etc., have been analogically created. The sematology involved is that of Germ. *Zungeln* defined by Sander's Wört., s. v.: Schlangenhaft falsch sein und wirken, nam: von einer hinter scheinbarer Harmlosigkeit sich bewegenden lauernden Bosheit. The much-talked-of Euripidean line, 'Hipp.' 612:

ἡ γλῶσσ' ὀμώμοχ' ἡ δὲ φρὴν ἀνώμοτος,

is commonly warped to this sense. English two-tongued may also be brought in evidence, and Sk. *jihmá-* means 'false,' 'treacherous.'

For the √*ĝliĝh* it seems as if we could almost go back to its physiological origin. The tongue makes no more characteristic noise than the implosive sound produced by fitting the tongue close to the palate, and then drawing it very suddenly down. I have made the sound for a number of people and have asked them to pronounce it. The invariable answer has been 'click.' The Aryan explosive rendering of this implosive sound was *ĝliĝh*. The meaning 'lick' was subsequent to 'tongue.' I attempt to bridge the connection of noun and verb in my studies in Agglutination which will be summarized in the *Proceedings of the Am. Or. Soc.* for 1894.

EDWIN W. FAY.
Washington and Lee Univ.

"EARTH UPON EARTH."

THE stanzas published by Dr. W. P. Reeves under the title "Earth upon Earth" in MOD. LANG. NOTES for April (ix, 204) consist of two distinct documents: (1) the poem "Earth upon Earth" (seven stanzas, twenty-eight verses), and (2) the lines "Whoo soo hym bethowght," etc. (vv. 29–31 in Dr. Reeves's numbering).

The second of these documents was long ago published by Thomas Wright, 'Rel. Ant.,' i, 235–236 (repeated in Mätzner, 'Altengl. Sprachpr., Poesie,' p. 51). *Bede* in Dr. Reeves's text is not "prayer," as he interprets it, but a bad form for *bedde*. In several other particulars Wright's text (Arundel MS. 292) furnishes better readings than those of the Stratford scroll. A similar scrap is in 'Rel. Ant.' i, 160.

The poem "Earth upon Earth" has been several times published. The Stratford text is given by Longfellow (apparently from R. B. Wheler, 'History and Antiquities of Stratford-upon-Avon,' p. 98)[1] in 'Outre-Mer' (Père

1 See *Notes and Queries*, 3rd Ser., i, 389.

I have not seen Bateman's volume. The title-page, as given in the British Museum Catalogue, runs "The Five Wounds of Christ. A Poem. From an ancient Parchment Roll. By William Billyng. Manchester, 1814." The volume is a quarto and but forty copies were printed. Dr. Furnivall, with much probability, conjectures that Billyng was the copier not the author of "The Five Wounds" and the other pieces (including "Earth upon Earth") found in the roll (see his remarks in *Notes and Queries*, 4th Ser., iii, 103). As to the MS., which Bateman dates "about the reign of Henry V.," see Jewitt, *id.*, p. 229.

la Chaise, note). Another text was edited by William Bateman in 1814. From Bateman, Montgomery reprinted the poem in his 'Christian Poet,' 3d ed., p. 58 (see *Notes and Queries*, 1st Ser., viii, 110). Robert Thornton's MS. (about 1440) contains a version corresponding in general to the first five stanzas of the Stratford text. Thornton's copy has been twice printed (in Perry, 'Religious Pieces in Prose and Verse,' E. E. T. S., 1867, no. x, p. 95, and in the revised edition of the same, 1889, p. 96). A longer version consisting of twelve stanzas has been edited by Furnivall ('Hymns to the Virgin,' etc., E. E. T. S., 1867, pp. 88–90) from Lambeth MS. 853. The Lambeth version has all the Stratford stanzas. Parts of "Earth upon Earth" have been rather often utilized as epitaphs (see *Notes and Queries*, 1st Ser., vii, 577, viii, 575; 3rd Ser., i, 389, ii, 55; Milledulcia, 1857, p. 258).

A much older English poem on the same subject, with the corresponding Latin ("Terram per injuriam cum terra lucratur"), has been at least twice printed (from MS. Harl. 913),—by Wright, 'Rel. Ant.,' ii, 216–218; by Furnivall, 'Early English Poems and Lives of Saints,' Philol. Soc., 1862, pp. 150–152. There are some striking resemblances between this and "Earth upon Earth," and it is not improbable that the earlier poem inspired the later.

Of the three Latin leonines cited by Dr. Reeves (col. 205)—

> Sede se[de]ns ista judex inflexibilis sta
> Sit tibi lucerna lex lux pellisque paterna
> A manibus reuoces munus ab aure preces—

the following verses are evidently a translation:

> ȝis[2] is ȝi sete, domes man,
> ȝif rihtful dom ȝif ȝow kan;
> Wiht ȝin hond tak ȝow no gifte,
> Ne for bisekiug doi non unriht;
> Lawe and lſht is ȝi faderis fel,
> Loke on ȝat and deme wel!
> —'Rel. Ant.,' ii, 120 (from Harl. MS. 2316).

The second stanza of the Scottish poem printed by Dr. Reeves in col. 206 corresponds to st. i of the "Song" edited by Halliwell, 'Rel. Ant.,' i, 56, from Harl. MS. 3810 (fifteenth century); cf. also 'Rel. Ant.' i, 233.

G. L. KITTREDGE.

Harvard University.
(April 12, 1894.)

[2] For þ Wright prints ȝ in his extracts from this manuscript.

TEAT-YURE.

ONCE upon a time there was a school-mistress whose sense of humor had not been entirely destroyed by the necessity of posing five hours a day as an oracle. In a fit of disgust at the unthinking way in which "facts" are received and spread abroad, she turned suddenly upon her pupils—several of whom had for some time been brandishing their arms and calling, in a stage whisper, "Teacher, teacher"!—and said to them: "Now, children, which do you think is the right pronunciation, *teacher* or *teat-yure*?" And the class, with one voice, unhesitatingly responded: "Teat-yure!"

How could they answer otherwise? Had they not been carefully taught to say *nate-yure*, *fort-yune*, *ed-yucate*—clumsy combinations which they had never heard from any human being outside of the school-room? Were they not forced to the conclusion that the pronunciation which nobody ever uses is invariably the correct one? And, in point of fact, why is *teat-yure* so much worse than *feat-yure*? From the historical and the phonological standpoint one is as justifiable as the other; the two are equally harmonious; and, as for usage, the preference for *feacher*, among cultivated speakers, is scarcely less marked than the predilection for *teacher*.

A hundred years ago orthoepists really attached some importance to the practice of good speakers. Sheridan (1780), Walker (1791), and even Smart (1836) prescribe the *ch* sound in *feature*, *natural*, *nature*, *virtuous*, etc.; and Walker gives the *j* sound in *educate*. But later dictionary-makers have generally been inclined to follow their own arbitrary notions, or the vagaries of their colleagues, rather than the good examples they must have had about them. The best and most recent publications are not satisfactory in this respect. Murray purposely and confessedly gives the preference everywhere to the more artificial forms; the 'Century' dodges the question by